



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,594	04/22/2004	Ken-Jen Yu	3744-04398-4	6879
7590 03/24/2009 Webb Ziesenheim Logsdon Orkin & Hanson, P.C. 700 Koppers Building 436 Seventh Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818				
EXAMINER HOPKINS, CHRISTINE D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3735				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/829,594

Applicant(s)

YU, KEN-JEN

Examiner

CHRISTINE D. HOPKINS

Art Unit

3735

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5 and 7-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5 and 7-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2 March 2009 has been entered. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-21 are now pending. The examiner acknowledges the amendments to claims 1, 9, 11 and 13, as well as the cancellation of claims 2, 4 and 6, and the addition of claims 18-21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites "a jointing structure of at least said main body and said minor part." It is unclear, based on this recitation, whether or not the body and minor part have respective jointing structures or a single jointing structure exists on the main body.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cattnach (U.S. Patent No. 5,013,297). Cattnach discloses an apparatus comprising a hollow longitudinally extending member for placement within the vagina. Regarding claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11 and 13, Cattnach teaches a device comprising a main body having a hollow columnar structure **2**, a minor part **3** and a "jointing structure" (screwthread or fastener) of said main body and said minor part for connection between the two (Figs. 1 and 2 and col. 4, lines 40-52). The main and minor parts are also interpreted as the "plural petal structures" in accordance with claim 9 because there is no special technical definition associated with this particular structure in the specification, hence, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the term "petal" is given. Many different shapes and types of petals exist, therefore a possibility of many different interpretations also exist. Regarding claims 10, 14, 18 and 19, the petal structures are porous due to openings **11**, and flow passage **5** (Figs. 1 and 2). Further regarding claim 19, the openings are capable of passing a tissue fluid therethrough. Regarding claim 5, the minor part has an arc-shaped surface (Fig. 2).

With respect to claim 12, the device is considered to be a "one-end opened hollow structure" as depicted in Fig. 2. Regarding claims 15-17, the plural structures are identical structures (Fig. 5), yet are also different as evidenced by Fig. 1.

Regarding claim 21, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Since the device of Cattanach is inserted into the vagina, it is capable of being used for vaginal reconstruction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattanach (U.S. Patent No. 5,013,297) in view of Abbott et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,276,056) and further in view of Gehling (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0144639). Cattanach discloses the invention as claimed, see rejection supra; however Cattanach fails to disclose that the vaginal device is covered by a skin graft. Abbott et al. (hereinafter Abbott) discloses a douching device for applying a therapeutic substance to a patient. Regarding claim 20, Abbott teaches that the douching device may also be used to

introduce or apply one or more therapeutic substances into the vaginal canal (col. 18, lines 66-67 - col. 19, lines 1-18). However, the combination of Cattnach and Abbott fails to disclose that the therapeutic substance is a skin graft. Gehling discloses a tampon adapted to deliver a therapeutic agent to a patient. Regarding claim 20, Gehling teaches the application of various vaginal therapeutic materials [0002] such as grafting material [0024]. Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated a grafting material for therapeutic treatment as suggested by Gehling, to a device for applying a therapeutic substance as suggested by the combination of Cattnach and Abbott, in order to promote healing and tissue growth within a human cavity.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 2 March 2009 with respect to the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) citing Reinbolt et al. ('123) have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) citing Cattnach ('297) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) citing Cattnach ('297) in view of Abbott et al. ('056) and further in view of Gehling (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0144639).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTINE D. HOPKINS whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 3735

(571)272-9058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7 a.m.-3:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor, II can be reached on (571) 272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Charles A. Marmor, II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3735

/C. D. H./
Christine D Hopkins
Examiner
Art Unit 3735